

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 39 were pending in the application at the time of examination.

Applicant(s) have amended the description to correct typographical errors and to properly reflect the status of the U.S. Patent Applications cited therein.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 19, 22, 23, 27, 30, 33, 36 and 38 are amended. Applicant submits support for the amendments is found in the specification as filed and that no new matter has been added.

Claims 24, 26, 28, 29, are cancelled.

Claims 1-23, 25, 27, and 30-39 remain pending in the application.

Claim Objections

In the Office Action at page 2, paragraph 2, the Examiner stated:

Claims 1, 3, 5, 19, 30, and 33 are objected to due to their non-descriptive preambles. All of the claims either recite either "A system comprising..." or "A method comprising...". This is insufficient, as the preamble should establish the environment or objective of the claimed invention, such as in the independent method claims 36 and 38.

Applicant has amended each of Claims 1, 3, 5, 19, and 30. More particularly, Applicant has amended each of Claims 3, 5, 19, and 30 to recite at least a preamble of "A method for synchronous collaborative shell integrated instant messaging comprising:...", and amended each of Claims 1 and 33 to recite at least a preamble of: "A system for synchronous collaborative shell integrated instant messaging comprising:...".

Applicant respectfully submits Claims 1, 3, 5, 19, 30 and 33 as amended establish the "environment or objective" of the claimed invention, and overcome the Examiner's objections.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to each of Claims 1, 3, 5, 19, 30 and 33.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §101

In the Office Action at page 2, paragraph 4, the Examiner stated:

Claims 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 22-29 claim a graphical user interface that is not tied to any physical device, making it software per se, which is merely functional descriptive material. Therefore, the claims fail to fall into any of the four statutory classes of invention: process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter.

Applicant has amended Claim 22 to recite at least "A graphical user interface for display to a user on a display device of a computer system coupled to a network, said graphical user interface comprising...". Applicant respectfully submits Claim 22 as amended recites statutory subject matter and overcomes the Examiner's rejection. As Claims 23, 25, and 27 depend from Claim 22, Applicant submits Claims 23, 25, and 27 also overcome the Examiner's rejection.

Applicant has cancelled Claims 24, 26, 28 and 29.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §112 rejections of each of Claims 22-29.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

In the Office Action at page 3, paragraph 6, the Examiner stated:

Claims 22 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for reciting a single means or step. Under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the enabling disclosure of the specification must be commensurate in scope with the claim under

consideration. The claims recite a single means or step and hence it covers every conceivable means for achieving the stated result, while the specification discloses at most only those means known to the invention.

Applicant has amended Claim 22 to recite at least:

at least one selectable identifier of a target computer system coupled to a network, said selectable identifier identifying an target computer system for connection in a synchronous collaborative shell integrated instant messaging session; and

at least one selectable identifier of a program selected from the group consisting of a script, a bot, and an agent, said selectable identifier identifying a program for execution in a synchronous collaborative shell integrated instant messaging session.

Applicant respectfully submits Claim 22 as amended recites statutory subject matter and overcomes the Examiner's rejection. As Claims 23, 25 and 27 depend from Claim 22, Applicant submits Claims 23, 25, and 27 also overcome the Examiner's rejection.

Applicant has cancelled Claims 24, 26, 28 and 29.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §101 rejections of each of Claims 22-29.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

Claims 1-12, 19-21, 30, and 32-35 are patentable over Pioch

In the Office Action at page 4, paragraph 8, the Examiner stated:

Claims 1-12, 19-21, 30, and 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pioch

("A short IRC primer", Edition 1.1b, February 29, 1993).

Claims 1 and 2

With regard to Claim 1, The Examiner at page 4, paragraph 9, stated:

As to claim 1, Pioch discloses a system comprising:...

...a collaborative shell program and an instant messaging (IM) server application coupled with the collaborative shell program (pg. 4, sec. 1.1: paragraph 5, IRC clients read on "a collaborative shell program")...

Applicant has amended Claim 1. Claim 1 as amended recites in part at least:

an instant messaging (IM) server computer system coupled to the network, the IM server computer system comprising:

a collaborative shell program, the collaborative shell program for linking the command line interface of a command line interface (CLI) shell program on one or more user computer systems to an instant messaging/chat capability of an IM server application to permit a user of the at least one user computer system to issue commands to at least one target computer system on the network via a chat window displayed to the user on the at least one user computer system, and

an instant messaging (IM) server application coupled with the collaborative shell program... (emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits the citations to Pioch relied on by the Examiner do not describe or suggest at least a collaborative shell program on an IM server that links a command line interface of a CLI shell program on a user computer system to an instant messaging/chat capability of an IM server application on the IM server such that the user of the user computer system can issue commands to a target

computer system on the network via a chat window displayed to the user.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits Claim 1 as amended is not anticipated by Pioch and overcomes the Examiner's rejection. As Claim 2 depends from Claim 1, Applicant submits Claim 2 is also not anticipated by Pioch and overcomes the Examiner's rejection.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102 rejections of each of Claims 1 and 2.

Claims 3 and 4

With regard to Claim 3, Applicant has amended Claim 3 similarly to Claim 1. Thus, for at least the same reasons as Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits Claim 3 is not anticipated by Pioch. As Claim 4 depends from Claim 3, Applicant submits Claim 4 is also not anticipated by Pioch.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102 rejections of each of Claims 3 and 4.

Claims 5-18

With regard to Claim 5, Applicant has amended Claim 5 similarly to Claim 1. Thus, for at least the same reasons as Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits Claim 5 is not anticipated by Pioch. As Claim 6-18 depend from Claim 5, Applicant submits Claims 6-18 are also not anticipated by Pioch.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102 rejections of each of Claims 5-12.

Claims 19-21

With regard to Claim 19, Applicant has amended Claim 19 similarly to Claim 1. Thus, for at least the same reasons as Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits Claim 19 is not anticipated by Pioch. As Claim 20-21 depend from Claim 19, Applicant submits Claims 20-21 are also not anticipated by Pioch.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102 rejections of each of Claims 19-21.

Claims 30

With regard to Claim 30, Applicant has amended Claim 30 similarly to Claim 1. Thus, for at least the same reasons as Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits Claim 30 is not anticipated by Pioch. As Claim 31 and 32 depend from Claim 30, Applicant submits Claims 31 and 32 are also not anticipated by Pioch.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102 rejections of each of Claims 30 and 32.

Claims 33

With regard to Claim 33, Applicant has amended Claim 33 similarly to Claim 1. Thus, for at least the same reasons as Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits Claim 33 is not anticipated by Pioch. As Claim 34 and 35 depend from Claim 33, Applicant submits Claims 34 and 35 are also not anticipated by Pioch.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102 rejections of each of Claims 33-35.

Claims 22-29 and 36-39 are patentable over Appelman

In the Office Action at page 8, paragraph 22, the Examiner stated:

Claims 22-29 and 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Appelman (US Pat. 6,677,968).

Applicant has amended Claim 22 to recite:

...at least one selectable identifier of a target computer system coupled to a network, said selectable identifier of a target computer system identifying an target computer system for connection in a synchronous collaborative shell integrated instant messaging session; and

at least one selectable identifier of a program selected from the group consisting of a script, a bot, and an agent, said selectable identifier identifying a program for execution in the synchronous collaborative shell integrated instant messaging session. (emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully submits the citations to Appelman relied on by the Examiner do not describe or suggest at least a selectable identifier of a target computer system that identifies a target computer system for connection in a synchronous collaborative shell integrated instant messaging session or a selectable identifier of a program that is a script, bot or an agent that is for execution in a synchronous collaborative shell integrated instant messaging session.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits Claim 22 as amended is not anticipated by Appelman and overcomes the Examiner's rejection. As Claims 23 and 25 depend from Claim 22, Applicant submits Claims 23 and 25 are also not anticipated by Appelman. Claim 24 has been cancelled.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102 rejections of each of Claims 22-25.

Claims 26-29

Claims 26, 28 and 29 have been cancelled and Claim 27 amended to depend from Claim 27. As Claim 27 depends from Claim 22, for at least the same reasons as Claim 22, Applicant submits Claim 27 is also not anticipated by Appelman.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102 rejections of each of Claims 26-29.

Claims 36 and 37

Applicant has amended Claim 36. Claim 36 as amended recites in part:

A method for monitoring status information over a network by a collaborative shell program on an instant messaging (IM) server computer system, the IM server computer system including an IM server application comprising:

periodically querying from a collaborative shell program on an instant messaging (IM) server computer system one or more target computer systems on a network for status information, the collaborative shell program for linking a command line interface of a command line interface (CLI) shell program on the one or more user computer systems to an instant messaging/chat capability of an IM server application on an IM server to permit users of the one or more user computer systems to issue commands to the one or more target computer systems on the network via a chat window displayed to the users on the one or more user computer systems;

receiving the status information returned from the one or more target computer systems; and

providing a user at a user computer system on the network with an indication of the status of the one or more target computer systems in a graphical user interface displayed on the user computer system by an instant messaging (IM) client application.

(emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully submits the citations to Appelman relied on by the Examiner do not describe or suggest at least

periodically querying one or more target computer systems on a network for status information from a collaborative shell program on an IM server computer system.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits Claim 36 as amended is not anticipated by Appelman and overcomes the Examiner's rejection. As Claim 37 depends from Claim 36, Applicant submits Claim 37 is also not anticipated by Appelman. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102 rejections of each of Claims 36 and 37.

Claims 38 and 39

Applicant has amended Claim 38. Claim 38 as amended recites in part:

A method for monitoring status information over a network by a collaborative shell program on an instant messaging (IM) server computer system, said IM server computer system including an IM server application comprising:

periodically querying from a collaborative shell program on an instant messaging (IM) server computer system at least one program selected from the group consisting of a script, a bot, and an agent for status information, the collaborative shell program for linking a command line interface of a command line interface (CLI) shell program on the one or more user computer systems to an instant messaging/chat capability of an IM server application on an IM server to permit users of the one or more user computer systems to issue commands to the one or more target computer systems on the network via a chat window displayed to the users on the one or more user computer systems;

receiving the status information returned from the at least one program; and

providing a user at a user computer system on the network with an indication of the status of the at least one program in a graphical user interface displayed on the user computer system by an instant messaging (IM) client application. (emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully submits the citations to Appelman relied on by the Examiner do not describe or suggest at least periodically querying at least one script, bot or agent for status information from a collaborative shell program on an IM server computer system.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits Claim 38 as amended is not anticipated by Appelman and overcomes the Examiner's rejection. As Claim 39 depends from Claim 38, Applicant submits Claim 39 is also not anticipated by Appelman. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102 rejections of each of Claims 38 and 39.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 13-18 are patentable over Pioch in view of Appelman
In the Office Action at page 11, paragraph 34, the Examiner stated:

Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pioch as applied to claims 5 and 12 above, and further in view of Appelman.

Claim 13 is patentable over Pioch in view of Appelman
In the Office Action at page 11, paragraph 35, the Examiner stated:

Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pioch as applied to claims 5 and 12 above, and further in view of Appelman.

Claims 13-18 depend from Claim, 5 as amended. Applicant respectfully submit that for at least reasons earlier discussed with regard to Claim 5, Claims 13-18 as amended are not anticipated by Pioch. The citations to Appelman in combination with Pioch do not cure the deficiencies of Pioch. More particularly, citing to Claim 5, the citations to McGee with Pioch do not describe or suggest:

...intercepting the text by a collaborative shell program on an instant messaging (IM) server, the collaborative shell program for linking a command line interface of a command line interface (CLI) shell program on the user computer system to an instant messaging/chat capability of an IM server application on the IM server to permit the user of the user computer system to issue commands to at least one target computer system on the network via a chat window displayed to the user on the user computer system...(emphasis added) .

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 13-18 are not obvious in view of and are patentable over Pioch in view of Appelman. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103 rejections of each of Claims 13-18

Claim 31 is patentable over Pioch in view of McGee
In the Office Action at page 13, paragraph 42, the Examiner stated:

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pioch as applied to claim 30 above, and further in view of McGee et al (US Pub. No. 2004/0019701), hereafter "McGee".

Claim 31 depends from Claim 30, as amended. Applicant respectfully submits that for at least reasons earlier discussed with regard to Claim 30 and Claim 1, Claim 30 as amended is not anticipated by Pioch. The citations to McGee in combination with Pioch do not cure the deficiencies of Pioch. More particularly, citing to Claim 30, the citations to McGee in combination with Pioch do not describe or suggest:

...intercepting the text at the IM server computer system by a collaborative shell program, the collaborative shell program for linking a command line interface of a command line interface (CLI) shell program on the user computer system to an

instant messaging/chat capability of an IM server application on the IM server to permit the user of the user computer system to issue commands to at least one target computer system on the network via a chat window displayed to the user on the user computer system, wherein the text includes one or more characters...(emphasis added).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 31 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over the Pioch in view of McGee. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103 rejection of Claim 31.

Conclusion


For the foregoing reasons, Applicant(s) respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

Request for Examiner Interview

Should the Examiner be of the opinion that this amendment does not place the Application in a condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests an Examiner interview prior to issuance of the next communication from the USPTO to expedite prosecution.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on July 23, 2007.



Attorney for Applicant(s)

July 23, 2007
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Lisa A. Norris
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 44,976
Tel.: (831) 655-0880